

App. No. 09/098,366
Amendment dated October 11, 2005
Reply to Office Action of July 26, 2005

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-6, 9-11, 13-15, 18-25, 27 and 28 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 10, 15, 21 and 22 have been amended. No new matter has been added. In view of the amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 3-6, 9-11, 13-15 and 18-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,857,212 issued to *Van De Vanter*, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,627,948 issued to *Fukunaga*. Claims 23-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Van De Vanter* in view of *Fukunaga*, and further in view of WordPerfect for Windows version 6.1. Claims 27 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Van De Vanter* in view of *Fukunaga*, and further in view of Multi-Edit Text Editor Version 8.0.

Claim 1, as amended, recites in part, "collecting context information regarding the location of the cursor in the electronic document by: if the location of the cursor is positioned over existing text, then collecting context information associated with the existing text; if the location of the cursor is not positioned over existing text, collecting context information associated with existing text that is proximate to the location of the cursor, wherein collecting context information comprises: examining an alignment of a line over which the cursor is positioned, examining whether there is text on the line over which the cursor is positioned, examining whether tab stops exist on the line over which the cursor is positioned, determining a horizontal position of the cursor on the line, determining a vertical position of the cursor in the document, determining the formatting of text above the cursor location when there is no text on the line over which the cursor is positioned, and determining the formatting of text below the cursor location when there is no text on the line over which the cursor is positioned and when there is no text above the cursor location..."

Neither *Van De Vanter*, *Fukunaga*, nor any combination thereof teach the limitations recited in Applicants' Claim 1. *Van De Vanter* teaches changing cursor presentation. The size of the top and bottom parts of an I-beam shaped cursor are varied to reflect the size of the visual whitespace gap between tokens in which the cursor is positioned (col. 36, lines 65-67). *Fukunaga* teaches changing the format of a sentence display for each line of text in a document

App. No. 09/098,366
Amendment dated October 11, 2005
Reply to Office Action of July 26, 2005

(Fig. 4). Changing the size of a cursor and the format of a sentence display is different from the limitations recited in Applicants' Claim 1.

Specifically, neither *Van De Vanter*, *Fukunaga*, nor any combination thereof teach "examining an alignment of a line over which the cursor is positioned, examining whether there is text on the line over which the cursor is positioned, examining whether tab stops exist on the line over which the cursor is positioned, determining a horizontal position of the cursor on the line, determining a vertical position of the cursor in the document, determining the formatting of text above the cursor location when there is no text on the line over which the cursor is positioned, and determining the formatting of text below the cursor location when there is no text on the line over which the cursor is positioned and when there is no text above the cursor location." Thus, neither *Van De Vanter*, *Fukunaga*, nor any combination thereof anticipates nor make obvious Applicants' Claim 1. Applicants therefore submit that Claim 1, as amended, is proposed to be allowable and notice to that effect is solicited.

Claims 9, 10, 14, 15, 18, 21 and 22, include substantially the same limitations discussed above in regard to independent Claim 1. As stated above, Claim 1 is proposed to be allowable. Therefore, Claims 9, 10, 14, 15, 18, 21 and 22 are proposed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1, and notice to that effect is solicited. Claims 3-6, 11, 13, 19, 20, 23-25, 27 and 28 are dependent on allowable base claims and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that Claims 1, 10, 15 and 22 are allowable.


App. No. 09/098,366
Amendment dated October 11, 2005
Reply to Office Action of July 26, 2005

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, all pending claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons stated above and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for Applicants at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.


John J. Farrell
Registration No. 57,291
Direct Dial: 206.342.6261

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P. O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
206.342.6200
[JJF/ab]

